



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE SOURCES AND MEDIÆVAL VERSIONS OF THE PEACE-FABLE.¹

Although the Middle Ages usually drew upon Classic tradition in the formation of their fable literature, they at times created new themes whose popularity equalled that of many older rivals. Of no small importance among such stories are those that deal with the false peace declared by a fox in order to deceive a seemingly simple-minded bird. The numerous versions of this fable that have come down to us since the middle of the eleventh century evidence strong interrelation, in spite of individual differences of character, scene, or action. The various forms become so well established by the beginning of the sixteenth century that a history of the fable is sufficiently complete if it comes down to the end of the Middle Ages. It is the object of this article to show what versions of the Peace-Fable existed before the sixteenth century, whence they arose, and what are their relations to one another. The following is a list of the mediæval versions :—

1. Ysengrimus, cir. 1150.
Ysengrimus, Liber Quintus, lines 133–316, Voigt, Halle, 1884.
2. Roman de Renart, cir. 1150.
Branch Ia, lines 1691–98.
Le Roman de Renart, Vol. I, pp. 47–8. Ernest Martin, Strasbourg and Paris, 1882.
3. Roman de Renart, cir. 1150.
Branch II, lines 469–594.
Le Roman de Renart, Vol. I, pp. 104–7.
4. Marie de France, cir. 1175.

¹ This article is the result of a paper presented in the Romance Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University, April, 1905. For assistance in the collection of material I am especially indebted to Dr. G. C. Keidel of that institution.

- Fabeln der Marie de France, Bibliotheca Normannica, Fable LXI, Vol. VI, p. 201, Warnke, Halle, 1898.
5. Romulus Treverensis, cir. 1175.
Les Fabulistes Latins, Vol. II, pp. 533-534, or Vol. II², pp. 599-600. Hervieux, Paris, 1884 and 1894.
 6. Jacques de Vitry, cir. 1225.
The Exempla of Jacques de Vitry, p. 7. T. F. Crane, London, 1890.
 7. Willem's van den Vos Reinaerde, cir. 1250.
Reinaert, pp. 10-14, lines 315-420. Ernest Martin, Paderborn, 1874.
 8. Gerhard von Minden, 1270.
Die Fabeln Gerhards von Minden, p. 167. Leitzmann, Halle, 1898.
 9. Romulus Bernensis, 1275.
Les Fabulistes Latins, Vol. II², p. 311, Fable XXXII.
 10. Reinaert's Historie, cir. 1278.
Reinaert, pp. 116-118, lines 343-448.
 11. Paris Promptuarium, 1322.
Bibliotheca Normannica, Vol. VI, Einleitung, p. lxviii, Ex. 27.
 12. Nicole Bozon, cir. 1325.
Nicole Bozon, No. 61, p. 84. Société des Anciens Textes Français.
 13. Bromiardus, cir. 1390.
Summa Prædicantium, J., Chap. VII, 8. Antwerp, 1614.
 14. Magdeburger Aesop, 1402.
Gerhard von Minden, p. 67, No. XLVII. W. Seelmann, Bremen, 1878.
 15. Leipziger Aesop, cir. 1450.
Einladungsschrift zur Feier des Heuflingischen Gedächtnistages. Fable LXXXVIII, Meiningen, 1897.
 16. Poggius, cir. 1450.
Les Facéties du Pogge Traduites en Français avec le Texte Latin, No. LXXIX, Vol. I, p. 125. Paris, 1878.
 17. Steinhöwel, Latin version, cir. 1475.
Steinhöwel's Äsop, No. 164, Fable XXIII, p. 350. Österley, Stuttgart, 1873.
 18. Steinhöwel, German version, cir. 1475.
Steinhöwel's Äsop, Fable XXIII, p. 351.
 19. Caxton, 1484.
Fables of Aesop, Vol. II, pp. 307-309. Joseph Jacobs, London, 1889.
 20. Reinke de Vos, 1498.
Reinke de Vos, lines 317-404, pp. 10-13. August Lübben, Oldenburg, 1867.
 21. De Vos ün de Hane, cir. 1500.
Zeitschrift für Deutsches Altertum, Fünfter Band, pp. 406-412, lines 161-220. M. Haupt, Leipzig, 1845.

In addition to these versions there are others that are either lost or inaccessible for other reasons. Among these are the following :—

22. Romulus Anglo-Latinus, cir. 1100.
23. Alfred of England, cir. 1150.
24. Original Promptuarium, cir. 1300.
25. Rheims Promptuarium, 1325, Fable xxvii.
26. Romulus Harleianus, cir. 1375.
27. Hendrik van Alkmaar, 1477.
28. Die historie van Reynaert de vos, 1479.
29. Jules Machaut, 1479.
30. Guillaume Tardif, cir. 1490.

In the sixteenth and subsequent centuries the fable appears in numerous collections and spreads through a great part of Europe. It is found in La Fontaine, Kirchhof, Legrand d'Aussy, and other fabulists. It extends as far as Russia in the form of oral tradition. These later versions are, however, readily traced back to the older forms. Before taking up a history of the latter, some attention must be paid to the story as it has come down to us.

A good idea of the plot of our fable may be had from the accounts of Marie de France, Jacques de Vitry, and Caxton, which are here given in the order named.

Marie's version is in substance the following :—

“A dove was sitting upon a cross. A fox passed below and saw him. He spoke aloud and said to him, ‘Why do you sit up there in so strong a wind? Now, come down and sit beside me in shelter.’

‘In faith, I do not dare,’ he replied.

‘Do not be afraid of me, and I can tell you why. I was recently at an assembly where many people were gathered together. A letter came from the king, who commanded in good faith that no beast should injure another beast nor any bird; God forbid that war should be between them any more. He desires to have peace in his land; bird and beast will be able to go and play together.’

‘Now will I descend,’ said the dove. ‘But I see yonder near the bushes two horsemen riding very quickly, and bringing two dogs with them.’

‘Are they very near?’ said the fox.

'They ride steadily,' said he.

'It is better that I go into the wood than have strife or uproar with them. I do not know whether they have heard the letter which came from the king; I assure you that I would not have to leave if they had heard it.' "

Marie then concludes with the appropriate reflection that many knaves are abroad in the land.

The story of Jacques de Vitry, as will be shown later, is not descended from Marie's version, and gives a somewhat different account of the events:—

"A fox saluted a titmouse, who asked, 'Whence do you come?' He replied, 'From the king's council, where was sworn a peace, to be observed by all birds and beasts. Wherefore I ask you to give me a kiss of peace.'

'I am afraid you will catch me,' said she.

'Come in safety,' said the fox. 'See, I will shut my eyes, so that I won't be able to catch you.'

The bird agreed and flew before the fox, but when he tried to catch her with his open mouth, she quickly flew away, laughing at the fox, who had wished to betray her contrary to the oath of peace."

Caxton's version shows a further development of the story. His quaintly humorous English can speak for itself:—

"Alle the sallary or payment of them that mokken other is for to be mocqued at the last as hit appiereth by this present Fable of a Cock whiche somtyme sawe a foxe comynge toward hym sore hongry and famysshed whiche Cock supposed Wel that he came not toward hym but for to ete somme henne for which cause the Cock maade al his hennes to flee vpon a tree And whan the foxe beganne tapproche to the said tree he began to crye toward the cock good tydynges good tydynges And after he sawled the cok ryght reuerently & demaunded of hym thus O godsep what dost thou ther soo hyghe And thy hennes with the hast not thou herd the good tydynges worthy and prouffitable for vs And thenne the Cok ful of malyce ansuerd to hym Nay verily godsep but I praye the telle and reherce them unto us Thenne sayd the foxe to the cok Certaynly godsep they be the best that ever ye herd For ye may goo and come talke and communyque among alle beestes withoute any harme or dompage And they shalle doo to yow bothe pleasyr and alle seruyse to them possible for thus it is concluded and accorded and also confermed by the grete counceyll of all bestes And yet they haue made commaundement that none be so hardy to vexen ne lette in no wyse any other be it neuer soo lytyll a beest For the whiche

good tydynges I praye the that thou wylt come doune to thende that we may goo and synge Te deum laudamus for Joye And the cok whiche knewe wel the fallaces or falsshede of the foxe ansuerd to hym in this manere Certaynly my broder and my good Frend thou hast brought to me ryght good tydynges whereof more than C tymes I shalle thanke the And sayenge these wordes the Cock lyfte vp his neck and his feet and loked farre fro hym And the foxe sayd to hym what godsep where aboute lokest thou And the Cok ansuerd to hym Certaynly my broder I see two dogges strongly and lyghtly rennyng hytherward with open mouthes whiche as I suppose come for to brynge to vs the tydynges whiche thou hast told to vs And thenne the Foxe whiche shoke for fere of the two dogges sayd to the Cock god be with you my frend It is tyme that I departe fro hens or these two dogges come nerer And sayenge these wordes toke his waye & ranne as fast as he myght And thenne the cock demaunded and cryed after hym godsep why rennest thou thus yf the sayd pacte is accorded thou oughtest not to doubte no thyng Ha a godsep sayd the Foxe from ferre I doubte that these two dogges haue not herd the decreet of the pees And thus whanne a begyler is begyled he receyued the sallary or payement whiche he ought to haue wherfore lete euery man kepe hym self ther fro."

In spite of Caxton's amplifications, it is evident that he is much nearer to Marie than he is to Jacques de Vitry. The latter adds the kiss *motif*, and the bird descends. In the *Roman de Renart* we have these *motifs*, but also the approach of rescuers, as in Marie. *Ysengrimus* makes the fox produce a counterfeit decree, in which he is followed by the Flemish and Low-German versions. In Gerhard von Minden the fox is killed, while in several others the bird suffers a similar fate. To show the relations that exist between so widely differing versions, we must go back to the beginnings of the fable in the twelfth century and observe its gradual subsequent development.

A reference to the list of versions will show that there are five of these that antedate the thirteenth century. These are the *Ysengrimus*, the two *Renart* versions, Marie de France, and *Romulus Treverensis*. The last is so close to Marie that we may disregard it for the present. Marie admits Alfred of England as her source and, as he descended

from the Anglo-Latin *Romulus*, we should probably find our fable in both these collections if they were not lost. The fable does not occur in the *Romulus Nilantii*, the *Romulus Vulgaris*, or any document earlier than the twelfth century. We have, then, four varieties of the story existing in the twelfth century, from which the later versions will be shown to descend.

Now three of these versions are epic and two of the accounts follow immediately upon the fable of the *Cock and Fox*. In the *Ysengrimus* the cock is still sitting on the branch of the tree whither he has escaped at the close of the latter fable, when our own fable begins. In the *Renart* the bird is a *mésange* and not a cock, which shows an exterior influence. But the contiguous position of our fable and the *Cock and Fox* is found not only in the epic *Renart* and *Ysengrimus*, but in Marie, Gerhard von Minden, *Romulus Treverensis* and other non-epic works. From this it seems probable that an epic version was the original, from which later collectors arranged the order of their fables. This is a more natural conclusion than an inference that the epic writer had drawn upon some fable collection, now lost, which had its stories arranged in just the order appropriate to his epic narrative. This animal epic priority is further attested by the frequent reference in Marie's and other versions to the parliament or council of beasts, a thing more nearly akin to the *Renart* stories than to the Classic fables. We have, too, the chronological evidence that our earliest extant versions, the *Ysengrimus* and the *Renart*, are prominent representatives of the animal epic.

Taking, then, a lost epic narrative as the original version from which the *Ysengrimus*, *Romulus*, and *Renart* descend, we have the story of a fox who fails to lure a bird with a false declaration of peace on account of the arrival of hunters. That the animal is a fox is the unanimous testimony of the

versions. The bird, on the other hand, is represented as a dove, a titmouse, a cock, and a little bird. The latter seems to be a Latin translation of the French *mésange*, a titmouse. This titmouse appears in two versions only and owes its existence there to the influence of the Kiss-Fable, with which no other versions than these are connected. In the first *Renart* version there is a squirrel instead of a bird, but as the passage contains only eight lines and as every other version has a bird, we may disregard this account.

From the evidence of the versions, therefore, it is evident that the bird of the original story was either a cock or a dove. As seven accounts show the dove, and nine the cock, there appears to be little reason for considering one more than the other as the original type. Nor does the chronology help us, for we have both birds in early as well as later versions. Warnke thinks, however, that the dove is more likely to have been the original form, as it is pre-eminently the bird of peace and consequently especially appropriate to the Peace-Fable. He explains the cock as due to the presence of the fox, since the two are often associated in the popular imagination.

His theory in regard to the dove's priority is probably sound, but his explanation does not sufficiently explain the change to the cock that appears in many of the versions. If the mere presence of the fox could bring about such a transformation, why did it fail to produce it in cases where the dove or the titmouse appears? As Warnke offers no answer to this, we must modify his explanation. In the case of the *Ysengrimus* it is not the simple presence of the fox, but rather the association with the *Cock and Fox* fable, as part of the same narrative, that changes the bird. The versions that descend from *Ysengrimus* then keep this same cock. In *Renart*, as has been shown, the special influence of the Kiss-Fable is at work to make the bird a

mésange. As the other early accounts are not placed in a long narrative poem, they retain the dove. There is, however, a later fifteenth century group that retains the cock, though it does not appear to descend from *Ysengrimus*. This is Poggius's version, with those of his followers. Here, however, the cock may be explained from the altered view as to the character of the pursuit of the hunters.

That this difference exists is evident from an examination of the versions. It is real in the majority of the accounts and especially in those of early date. In others, as Marie, the approach is told by the bird to the fox, so that it cannot be known whether it is real or feigned. As, however, there is no allusion to a trick on the part of the bird, it is likely that an actual approach is intended. Later, however, in Poggius and his followers, the idea arises that the hunters do not really come up, but that the bird represents them as so doing, in order to rid himself of the fox. This is the *motif* that gives the fable its most artistic form. It is interesting to note how it develops. First we find the actual approach told by the author, then the actual approach told by the bird, and finally the feigned approach invented by the latter in order to outwit his enemy. Now at this stage, the dove ceases to be an appropriate bird. The conception of the bird as deceived is replaced by one which regards him as deceiving. Here we see the reason why Poggius changes Marie's simple dove to his own wily cock, a bird that has been already known as outwitting the fox in the *Cock and Fox* fable. If, then, we bear in mind this changed conception of the pursuit and the character of the bird, we find the presence of the cock in the Poggius group sufficiently explained. This leaves the dove as the original bird of the fable.

But the character of the pursuit and the species of the bird are, after all, not the most important features of our

fable. Its distinguishing *motif* is the universal Peace, which the fox invents to deceive the bird. To investigate its sources, we must distinguish between the *motif* of luring by a ruse and that of the Peace among all animals. The first idea is common enough in Classic literature as far back as the Sanskrit. We have heard of the tiger that lured the Brahmin, of the *Sick Lion*, the *Wolf and Kid*, the *Cock and Fox*. There is no evidence that any one of these affected directly the plot of our fable, but the luring idea is so common to fable literature that its general influence must have been felt by the author of our original version.

The idea of the Peace, however, is the really original *motif* of our fable. This, as far as we know, occurs neither in Sanskrit, Greek, nor Classic Latin. It is true that in these three languages we have belief in a future Golden Age, but if this idea did not work into the fable literature in its Classic and creative period, we can hardly expect to find it there in later times without some strong outside influence. But just this influence is offered us in the Bible, which, besides general allusions to a future period of peace, gives in the eleventh chapter of Isaiah the familiar account of the Millennial Kingdom, in which the various hostile animals shall be at peace with one another. There is nothing improbable in the theory that some one who had heard the Biblical account of this universal Peace, but was only too familiar with the contrast offered by the world about him, put this report into the mouth of the crafty fox in order to deceive the piously credulous bird.

It is logical, then, to conclude that the Biblical idea of a general peace among animals was united with the luring *motif*, so familiar in fable literature from the Sanskrit down ; that the first actors were a fox and a dove, the latter of whom is saved from the former's wiles by the actual approach of hunters. The story thus constituted was then

taken into an animal epic, in which the *Cock and Fox* fable found a contiguous position. From this original account descend, either directly or through lost versions, the twelfth century tales of *Ysengrimus*, Anglo-Latin *Romulus*, and *Renart*. With the last we meet versions that can be examined and whose relations with each other must be discussed in detail.

To arrive at the connection existing between the various extant versions, use has been made of external evidence for dates and other points, but especial stress has been laid upon the internal evidence, derived from a careful study of the versions themselves. For this purpose a table of some 396 *motifs* has been prepared, which makes evident the points of likeness and unlikeness existing between the various versions. The complete table cannot be shown here on account of lack of space, but the most important *motifs*, to the number of 47, have been placed in a table at the end of this article. It indicates sufficiently the method of work, and it remains only to be said that the investigation of the minor *motifs* as a whole goes to substantiate the results that appear in the following pages. We shall now take up the versions in their chronological order.

The first of our versions, the *Ysengrimus*, contains 183 Latin elegiacs, padded in every conceivable fashion. Thoughts are few and words are many. The cock announces the approach of the hunters in the sixtieth verse, yet the fox stays to argue till the end. Wearisome moralizing is a striking feature of the account. It is the only one of the early versions in which the peace is announced in documentary form. Its story in general is the same as that of the other twelfth century varieties of the fable, but none of these seem to be descended from it.

The first appearance of the Peace-Fable in the *Roman de Renart* is in Branch Ia, where the fox, in mentioning his

noteworthy deeds, speaks of having enticed the squirrel from an oak by telling him about the peace that had been sworn. The account is very brief and seems a mere reference to a tale told elsewhere. Except in the matter of the peace, it has little to do with the much more extensive version of *Renart*, Branch II. The latter contains over a hundred lines and gives us a story that agrees in general with those of Marie and *Ysengrimus*. It introduces, however, the *motif* of the kiss offered the bird by the fox, which appears again in Jacques de Vitry and *Romulus Bernensis*. This *motif* is found also in stories that have nothing to do with the Peace, such as the *Reineke Fuchs* and those of John of Capua and Guidrinus. In fact, there appears to be a full Kiss-Fable tradition that is originally entirely independent of the Peace-Fable, but which has been united with the latter in three of our versions. As has been shown before, it is the influence of this Kiss-Fable that accounts for the appearance of the bird in *Renart*, Branch II, as a *mésange* or titmouse, instead of a dove. There is no evidence that either of these *Renart* versions is descended from the *Ysengrimus*, and as they date from about 1150, they could not descend from any other extant version. They may be considered as coming from the original lost version along with the other twelfth century accounts.

The versions of Marie de France and *Romulus Treverensis* date from about 1175 and are much alike in the general outlines of the story, as the characters, situations and chief *motifs* of action and speech are about the same. As, however, they are nearly contemporary versions, the difference in the details of their accounts makes it scarcely probable that either is descended from the other. The theory that both find their source in Alfred of England meets with no opposition in the internal evidence of their accounts of the Peace-Fable. The testimony of both versions, on the other

hand, is against their derivation from either *Renart* or *Ysengrimus*, for besides the fact that the bird is not the same, there are variations in important *motifs* that make such descent extremely improbable. In fact, the most satisfactory conclusion to be reached as to the five twelfth century versions of our fable is that they all derive from a common source, but are not more closely related, except in the case of Marie and *Romulus Treverensis*. For these we have external indications that point to their descent from Alfred of England, which, in turn, comes from the Anglo-Latin *Romulus*. The version of the latter, then, were it extant, would probably be found to fall into the class of the *Ysengrimus* and *Renart* versions, which we would derive from a common epic source.

We come now to the thirteenth century, whose earliest representative is found in Jacques de Vitry, about 1225. His version has been given in full. It is especially noteworthy for the presence of the kiss *motif* and that of the descent of the bird, as well as for the lack of mention of a rescue party. A moral is pointed concerning the seduction of women by evil priests. The only one of his *motifs* that does not appear in the *Renart*, Branch II, is a preliminary question of the bird, "Whence do you come?" which was probably inserted by the sermonizer to avoid the introduction that is to be found in the *Renart* version and to come at once to the Peace *motif*. The occurrence of the word *mésange* (or *masange*, as Vitry spells it) shows close relation to *Renart*. The author has evidently had difficulty in translating this word into Latin, and speaks of the "*volucrem que gallice mesange nominatur.*" This shows at once a French origin for his account, and as *Renart* is the only other version of the Peace-Fable in which the *mésange* occurs, the conclusion is obvious that Vitry drew from *Renart*. As, moreover, the work shows small relation to

any other twelfth century account, there is no valid objection to be brought against such a conclusion.

The next version of our fable was the *Reinaert*, written in Flemish about the year 1250. The earliest extant manuscript is dated 1400. The story differs decidedly from those previously described. The cock tells how he and his fifteen children were lured out of the barn-yard by the fox's declaration of peace and the monk's garb that he wore. The peace was stated in a letter, which the fox presented before leaving. The cock then issued out of the barn-yard with all his family and was attacked by the fox, who had hidden himself behind a hedge. As no guard or dog came to the rescue, eleven of the chickens fell a prey to the fox. This version is evidently more closely connected with the *Ysengrimus* than with any other. The bird is a cock and the news of the Peace is stated in a letter, neither of which *motifs* occurs in the *Renart* or the Anglo-Latin group. It is true that the story, especially in its ending, shows striking variations from the *Ysengrimus*, but these differences cannot be explained by positing another version as its source. The statement that no guard or dog came to the rescue indicates that the author had in mind a version where such intervention took place. The fact that it forms a part of an epic narrative indicates connection with *Renart* or *Ysengrimus*, but it does not show important *motifs* of the former, and while it is not a close imitation of the latter, it is, nevertheless, nearer to it than to any other version.

The earliest German version of the Peace-Fable is that of Gerhard von Minden in 1270. The title, bird, and story in general are the same here as in *Treverensis* and Marie, though we have a new *dénouement* in the killing of the fox by the dogs. The most casual reading shows that Gerhard is more closely allied to these two versions than to any other, so that to arrive at the position of his version in the

line of descent, we may consider it in connection with these two versions only. But while Gerhard approaches closely both Marie and *Romulus Treverensis*, a close examination of the *motifs* leaves no doubt as to whence it really descends. Marie's version shows practically no *motifs* which are found in Gerhard and not in Romulus. On the other hand, we find that both Romulus and Gerhard mention the weather, the court, and letters, of which Marie says nothing. The fox in *Romulus* and Gerhard, moreover, is spoken of as desiring the bird, as asking her to approach for conversation, and as looking askance at the bird. As these *motifs* do not occur in Marie's version, she is evidently less close to Gerhard than *Romulus* is. By the weight of this strong internal evidence, then, we may consider *Romulus Treverensis* the immediate source of Gerhard von Minden.

The year 1275 gives us one of our shortest versions in the *Romulus Bernensis*. The fox meets a little bird, tells her he comes from a parliament where peace has been sworn between birds and beasts, and asks that she approach and give him a kiss. The bird does so and is caught. The whole story contains but thirty-one words. The use of the word *avicula* for the bird would incline us to put the version with the *Renart-Vitry* group. If it had descended from the *Ysengrimus* or the Anglo-Latin *Romulus*, it could certainly have used a Latin equivalent of *cock* or *dove*. But if it drew from *Renart*, it had *mésange* to translate, which could hardly be better done than by *avicula*. From the story, too, as well as from the name of the bird, it can be seen that this version finds its source in the *Renart* or the *Vitry*, which are the only other versions that show both the Kiss and the Peace *motifs*. It is nearer *Vitry* than *Renart*, as, like the former, it commences with the statement that the fox comes from a parliament or assembly where peace was sworn among all beasts and birds, whereas the

Renart begins with the request for a kiss and later explains that Noble the Lion has decreed peace. The connection between the *Romulus Bernensis* and the Vitry is so close, indeed, that the former might be considered as a mere translation of the latter, were it not that in the *Bernensis* termination the bird is caught. This reminds us of *Renart*, Branch Ia, but while the ending is there the same, it is a squirrel that is caught and there is no allusion to a kiss or to all birds and beasts. It is possible, of course, that *Renart*, Branch Ia, may have some influence, but it does not at all show the close connection of the Vitry version. The ending may have been added, after all, without the knowledge of a similar *motif* that existed elsewhere, and merely to drive home the moral that follows the *Bernensis* version, *Docet habere cautelam*. There seems to be no doubt of its descent from Vitry, while a further connection with *Renart* is at least problematical.

In the list of versions three *Promptuaria* have been mentioned, the original version and those of Paris and Rheims. The original *Promptuarium*, which was dated about 1300, is lost. The Rheims manuscript of 1325 is known to contain our fable from the statement of Warnke in a note on page 166 of the *Festgabe für Hermann Suchier*. It comes from the original *Promptuarium* just as the Paris *Promptuarium* of 1322 does. An examination of the latter shows close relationship with Marie de France. Now we know that this *Promptuarium* frequently copies Marie and the internal evidence sustains this fact in regard to the Peace-Fable. While not a direct translation, the Paris manuscript shows sufficient similarity to Marie's version to make it safe to consider her as its source. Moreover, as the Paris comes from the original *Promptuarium*, which is only a few years older, we consider them both as descending from Marie.

The Rheims *Promptuarium*, then, takes its position by the side of the Paris and out of the original *Promptuarium*.

Nicole Bozon's version of 1320 is nearer to Marie's than to any other. It gives practically the same story with a few variations natural to a writer of sermons. Thus the dove is represented as sitting on cold stones, which is due, as Dr. Harry indicates, to the influence of an *exemplum* drawn from Jeremiah that immediately precedes the fable. Other departures from Marie are not striking, so that there should be no hesitation in considering her the source of Bozon.

From Nicole Bozon is derived the fable-collection known as the *Romulus Harleianus* of 1375. It almost certainly contained our fable, although it is not to be found there at present in consequence of the defective condition of the manuscript.

About 1390 appeared the *Summa Prædicantium* of Bromiardus, who has scattered numerous fables through his text. In one of these we read the account of a fox on his return from the lion's court, who replies to certain inquisitive young birds that peace has been made between himself and them. He then hangs his head in humility, by which sight the birds are so moved that they admit him to friendship with the inevitable result. The pastor then draws a moral concerning the wiles of the hypocrite. Now, though this version is not a direct translation of any previously mentioned, it shows decided resemblance to the Flemish *Reinaert*. Besides the *motif* of the Peace and the mention of the lion's court, which might be derived from any of our versions, we find here a number of birds instead of one, their location in an enclosure of some sort instead of on a perch, and the final destruction of the birds by the fox. These do not correspond to any older version, except the *Reinaert*. The humility of the fox in Bromiardus,

moreover, corresponds to his playing the monk in *Reinaert*. The birds destroyed are young in Bromiardus, just as they are in the Flemish account. Evidently the *Reinaert* is the most reasonable source of Bromiardus.

The *Magdeburger Aesop* appeared in 1402. The close connection existing between this and the Gerhard von Minden is shown by the use of the latter title for both fable collections. The Peace-Fable in both works follows the *Treverensis* story with the ending of the fox's death. Both versions show individual amplifications, but there can be no serious doubt as to the fact that Gerhard is the direct source of the *Magdeburger*.

To the same group belongs the *Leipziger Aesop*. It appears to descend from the *Magdeburger* with possibly some slight outside influence.

We now come to a group of closely related versions, whose descent is somewhat hard to prove. The first member is found in the *Facetiae* of Poggio Bracciolini, the Florentine. From him descend the various ramifications of Steinhöwel, resulting in the English version of Caxton cited above. As has been pointed out, it is in this version of Poggius that the idea of the bird's ruse first takes shape. Now the versions that are nearest Poggius are the *Ysengrimus*, Marie, and *Treverensis*. The facts that the bird is a cock and that he is sitting on a tree unite the story with *Ysengrimus*, but, on the other hand, the development of the plot is not the same, as, for example, in the *Ysengrimus* the fox goes away to find a letter, which does not happen in Poggius or Marie. The story of Poggius is the same in length and character as that of Marie. They have also similar details, as the opening of the conversation by a question from the fox and his subsequent excuse that the dogs may not have heard of the peace. An examination of the *motifs*, in fact, shows a closer relation

to Marie than to any other version of the fable. Finally, there is nothing from the external evidence to combat this theory, for a manuscript of Marie's fables is known to have been seen in Italy and Poggius visited numerous libraries in France. He is said, moreover, to have drawn on the *Fabliaux* for the material of some of his *Facetiæ*, so that there is no reason why he should not have drawn upon Marie for the Peace-Fable.

As soon as we have placed Poggius, Steinhöwel's Latin version follows as a matter of course. The merest glance at the two versions will show how nearly they are related. One is an almost literal transcription of the other, with a few changes of tense and word-order. Poggius puts his moral at the end of the version. Steinhöwel places the same moral at both beginning and end. The difference of title is easily explained, for in Poggius it is the *Cock and Fox*, which Steinhöwel had already used as the title of another fable. He accordingly calls his Peace-Fable the *Fox, Cock, and Dogs*. Besides this, the only *motif* that he adds is: "I think they are going to announce the peace which you predict."

The German Steinhöwel is even closer to the Latin Steinhöwel than the latter is to Poggius. It is Latin done into German with one minor *motif* omitted. This is the bird's request that the news be told, which exists in Poggius and the Latin Steinhöwel and consequently proves that the latter version comes from Poggius and not from the German Steinhöwel. This last is otherwise practically identical with the Latin version and is closer to it than to Poggius, so that it is clearly proved that Poggius gives rise to the Latin Steinhöwel, which is, in turn, copied into German.

Caxton's version of 1484 has been cited in full. He is known to have followed Poggius through Machaut's version

of 1479, but an examination of the internal evidence shows that this descent is through the Latin Steinhöwel, as Caxton has the latter's title and his new *motif* that is not found in Poggius. It is equally clear that Caxton does not come through the German Steinhöwel, for the one *motif* that is in the Latin but is wanting in the German reappears in Caxton. He may, then, be considered to have drawn from Poggius by means of the Latin Steinhöwel and Machaut.

The Low-German *Reinke de Vos* of 1498 is a translation of a Dutch poem by Hinrik van Alkmaar, which, though now lost, is known to descend from the Flemish *Reinaerts Historie*, written about 1278. An examination of the latter shows that it follows very closely Willem's *van den Vos Reinaerde*, which has been described above. The differences between the three versions are exceedingly slight. *Die historie van Reynaert de vos* of 1479 is a mere prosification of *Reinaerts Historie*.

Another Teutonic version is *De vos ün de Hane*, which G. W. Dasent copied from a manuscript in the royal library at Stockholm. As it is written in a hand of the beginning of the sixteenth century, it is the most recent of the versions examined. The mention in it of a false pope might be evidence of an earlier date, if one of the anti-popes is referred to. As, however, the last of these went out of office in 1409, references to them might still be popular in 1500. The whole passage covers 227 lines and includes the *Cock and Fox* as well as our own fable. The latter runs for some sixty lines at the end of the poem. The verses are very uneven and carelessly rimed. A vein of broad humor runs throughout. As in the *Ysengrimus*, the fox uses a piece of wood to represent the decree of peace, which here, however, comes from the Pope instead of the King. The rest of the story preserves in general the *Ysengrimus* tradition, in spite of changes in detail. Some of

these suggest outside influence, possibly that of the *Magdeburger Aesop* or of Gerhard von Minden. This influence, however, cannot be certainly established. On the other hand, the version not only shows a similar story to that of the *Ysengrimus*, but connects this closely with the *Cock and Fox*, which immediately precedes. This is just the case in *Ysengrimus*, as has been noted above.

This review of the versions may be closed by a brief reference to Guillaume Tardif, who brought out in 1490 a translation of the *Facéties du Pogge*. As this version is said to be a paraphrase of the original, we may conclude that the Peace-Fable is contained in the collection and that it comes directly from the version of Poggius.

To sum up in brief the history of the Peace-Fable, I repeat that it does not appear to have existed earlier than the Middle-Ages, but that it arose before the twelfth century from a combination of the Classic tradition of luring-fables and the Biblical idea of a universal peace among animals. Starting in a lost epic account, it spread through the collections of fabulists and sermonizers in France, Germany, England, Italy, and the Netherlands. These versions have been examined in detail as far down as the beginning of the sixteenth century. The relations that exist between them are further shown in a version tree and a table of *motifs* that follow. In conclusion it may be said that while the versions differ greatly in originality, matter, and style, the *ensemble* deserves to rank high in fable literature and is entitled to greater critical consideration than it has hitherto received.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

The Peace-Fable has received so little critical attention that the list of its bibliography is not extensive. The following are the most important works in which it is treated :

1. *Les Sources du Roman de Renart*, L. Sudre, pp. 288-94, Paris, 1892.
2. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, xv, 147 sq. Here C. Voretzsch treats especially of the relations between the Kiss-Fable and the Peace-Fable.
3. *Die Quellen des Esope der Marie de France*, Karl Warnke, pp. 208-10 of the *Festgabe für Hermann Suchier*, 1900.
4. *History of the Aesopic Fable*, J. Jacobs, i, p. 267, London, 1889.
5. *Fables Inédites*, A. C. M. Robert, i, 146, Paris, 1825.
6. *Oeuvres de J. de La Fontaine*, Henri Regnier, i, 175, Paris, 1883.
7. *A Comparative Study of the Aesopic Fable in Nicole Bozon*, P. W. Harry, pp. 58-62, Johns Hopkins Dissertation, Baltimore, presented in 1903.
8. *On the Sources of the Nonne Prestes Tale*, Miss K. O. Petersen, pp. 15 sq., Boston, 1898.
9. *Great Russian Animal Tales*, A. Gerber, pp. 20, 21, 66.

TABLE OF MOTIFS.

Fox.....	Y	Y	Ra	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Bird.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Dove.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Cock.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Chickens or young birds.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Mésange.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Rescuers.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Winter Weather.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Spring Weather.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Position of bird or squirrel.....	Y	Y	Ra	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
On a cross.....	Y	Y	Ra	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
On a tree.....	Y	Y	Ra	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Within an enclosure.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Fox approached bird.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Saw bird.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
Desired bird.....	Y	Y	..	R	M	T	V	W	G	B	H	P	N	Br	A	L	Po	S	Sg	C	Re	Vs
	Y = Ysengrimus.	Ra = Renart Branch Ia.	R = Renart Branch II.	M = Marie de France.	T = Romulus Treverensis.	V = Vitry.	W = Willem's Reinaert.	G = Gerhard von Minden.	B = Berne Romulus.	H = Reinaerts Historie.	P = Paris Promptuarium.	N = Nicole Bozon.	Br = Broulardus.	A = Magdeburger Aesop.	L = Leipziger Aesop.	Po = Poggius.	S = Latin Steinhöwel.	Sg = German Steinhöwel.	C = Caxton.	Re = Reinke de Vos.	Vs = Vos un de Hane.	

Asked, "why are you aloft?"	...	M	T	...	G	L	Po	S	Sg	C
Said, "in the wind."	...	M	T	...	G	A
Said, "fly hither."	...	M	T	...	G	A
" " "for conversation."	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox's invitation.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Bird's precaution.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox asked for a kiss.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Bird declined.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Peace announced.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox showed document.	...	M	T	...	G	A
A piece of wood.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox's humility.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox disguised as a monk.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox shut his eyes.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox concealed himself.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Peace eternal.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Peace (forbade) violence.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Creatures were allowed to play.	...	M	T	...	G	A
"I would not look on you wrongly."	...	M	T	...	G	A
Bird or squirrel went to fox.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Bird or squirrel was caught.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox killed birds.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Bird looked away.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Bird announced approach of rescuers.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox asked if they were near.	...	M	T	...	G	A
If he could escape.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox said it was best to leave.	...	M	T	...	G	A
"Bad news."	...	M	T	...	G	A
"It was doubtful whether they knew of decree."	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox's excuse about the Peace.	...	M	T	...	G	A
Fox was killed.	...	M	T	...	G	A